

Date: Thu, 14 Apr 94 04:30:09 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #171  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Thu, 14 Apr 94                      Volume 94 : Issue 171

Today's Topics:

ARRL rpt on preferred calls (2 msgs)  
LICENSING DELAYS (6 msgs)  
NEW RIG, BEGINNER

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.  
-----

Date: 13 Apr 94 19:14:21 GMT  
From: sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!srngenprp!alanb@hplabs.hp.com  
Subject: ARRL rpt on preferred calls  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

prvalko (prvalko@vela.acs.oakland.edu) wrote:

: Naturally, coming from Newington (in the 1 district) I would expect this  
: from their committee. 1 area and 0 area calls are the most desireable  
: as the most easily spell english language words. For example :  
-----

Date: Wed, 13 Apr 1994 12:57:52 GMT  
From: world!drt@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: ARRL rpt on preferred calls  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

prvalko (prvalko@vela.acs.oakland.edu) wrote:  
: Well, it sounds fairly reasonable

I'd agree.

: except for one clause, that being (of  
: course) the stipulation that calls be limited to the current call  
: district.

: Naturally, coming from Newington (in the 1 district) I would expect this  
: from their committee.

Huh? Did you look at the calls of the members of the committee? Or  
their current addresses? None has a 1 or 0 call, or lives in 1 or 0  
land.

: 1 area and 0 area calls are the most desireable  
: as the most easily spell english language words. For example :

: N1CE, W1SE, WH0A, N0CALL, WH0OPS and W1NS all come to mind as rather  
: interesting and fun calls.

Sorry, I'm going to agree with them on this one. I don't think the  
FCC should \*make\* you change your callsign when you're in a new  
district, but if that's where you are and you want a new call, you  
should get one that reflects your location, IMO. If that means not  
everyone can have K1SS, that's OK with me. (The biggest equity  
problem with this that I see is uneven population growth in the  
various districts.)

: If the poor folks stuck in 2,3,4,5,6,7,8,and 9 had a chance at these  
: calls, they would be gone in a flash!

A more substantial objection (read "the one I care about more") is  
that it looks, the way it's written, as though any club or repeater  
group with a single Extra member is going to be able to get a Group A  
callsign at the same time as any Extra-class individual. If so, these  
are \*really\* going to be gone in a flash, and since clubs are somewhat  
less mortal than people, the calls they snap up will be off the market  
more or less permanently.

I don't really know how to fix this, since contesting clubs certainly  
should have shorter calls. But surely not every repeater club or  
general purpose club needs one? Most clubs should probably get 2x3s,  
but I have no idea how to implement this objectively. Perhaps clubs  
should have last preference (or "gate"), individuals should have first  
crack at vacated calls, and perhaps preferred calls should be  
restriced to clubs that have been in existance for more than x years.

Other than that, I think the report is pretty good, too.

-drt

-----  
David R. Tucker      KG2S              8P9CL              drt@world.std.com
  
-----

Date: 13 Apr 94 12:52:08 GMT  
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu  
Subject: LICENSING DELAYS  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>weeks. But 12 weeks is absolutely assinine. I understand that there are  
>4 people in Gettysberg working on 610 apps. No they probably cant handle  
>the influx of requests.

the fcc didn't believe there'd be something like 4,000 to 6,000 applications  
per month either.

i received a message from a gent on compuserve that claimed in his experience  
in handling form 610s for a VEC's operation that 1 in 12 had something  
illegible with them. I can believe it -- we have people fill out 610s and put  
"M. I." for their "city". Sure everyone should know about Merritt Island - we  
sent men to the moon from there - but it's a bit much to expect folks outside  
of the Brevard County, FL, area to be familar with our geography...

>#1 Lets cut the beaurocratic excuses and get this mess cleaned up.

in work. things are getting set up for electronic data interchange between  
the VECs and the FCC. You can't just "ad hoc" this together since it's  
desired to be a long term solution that can be supported by both ends of the  
chain.

>#2 Lets get our public servants organized so that they can do their  
> jobs effeciantly for the nation.

in work. probably would help if people didn't call 'em to find out if their  
license was issued this morning/afternoon/etc.

>Where is our ARRL ???? What are our ARRL lawyers in washington doing?  
>Again we dont want to hear all the reasons and excuses! lets get something  
>done! NOW!

the VEC is working with the FCC for the EDI project.

It's sad that you think throwing lawyers at the problem will solve it. All that will do is cost lots of money and be counterproductive. The FCC thinks we hams adore and respect them and that's worth something to us when it comes to getting rules changed and adopted. We don't want them thinking of us as a Pain In The Arse for no good reason.

> I once had a commanding officer in the navy tell his junior officers;  
>Don't bring me problems, damn it, bring me solutions!

This is so the CO can blame someone else when the JO takes initiative and it backfires.

>Solution # 1

I don't know if the government can exactly do this without an Act of Congress.

For John Q. Public, it's not a problem since there's only about 700K out of 250M people affected.

>Solution # 2

In work. Recommend perusing the last 3-4 years of most of the general interest ham mags and newsletters and archives for this list and you'll find it's something everyone would have done sooner if funding was approved and people were given time to work on it. that's finally happened recently and it should be coming to bear on the problems this year.

>34 years. But I do have a group of Boy Scouts who have worked since last  
>Oct. to pass their exams in Feb. and are still waiting like I'm sure

well -- patience. Unless the dam breaks, they should get licensed around the week of May 16th. (take the day they took the test and add 12 weeks.) They can always start working on the next exam material or code or start setting up a station in the 3 months it's taking to turn over a license. Get 'em building some 1/4 wave ground planes and get 'em stuck up on the houses so they'll be able to work some folks on 2m w/o the need for a repeater and will be able to hit the repeater better because they have an outside antenna.

Do some dummy net practice at the next troop meeting (assign everyone a dummy call and let them practice making contacts and such).

Do some 3rd party participation and let them get air time that way.

Sure you've been doing all this in the last months but now it's really going to mean something since you now have them over the first hill.

bill wb9ivr (took about 8-10 weeks for my license in 1972...November 71 to January 72..was a tough christmas with the HF radio in the old garage...and no

license to use it.)

-----  
Date: Wed, 13 Apr 94 14:07:32 GMT  
From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx10!jshepherd@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: LICENSING DELAYS  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

My fiancée called the FCC and was told 14-16 weeks for her license????  
She took her test the first week of February!

-----  
Date: 13 Apr 1994 15:50:00 GMT  
From: nothing.ucsd.edu!brian@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: LICENSING DELAYS  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

If the delays and understaffing at the FCC Amateur licence processing center bother you so much, why not volunteer to help them one day a week? Ditto the ARRL VEC.

Just a few people doing this would clear the backlog in a short time.

What have you done for your hobby lately?  
- Brian

-----  
Date: 13 Apr 94 21:03:29 GMT  
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu  
Subject: Licensing Delays  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In response to the 'comment' on licensing delays and the possible role of the ARRL in reducing those delays.

Under discussion is a proposal to permit electronic filing from the VE/VEC to the FCC. In one possible implementation this would eliminate the key-in time at Gettysburg which seems to be one of the major components in the time of the total cycle to issue a license. Naturally this will require coordination among the various VEC's and the FCC. It is my understanding that the ARRL VEC is prepared to move virtually immediately. When the FCC is ready and the other VEC's are also ready (those who are interested in such a program-- and several are interested), I would expect it to be implemented. The FCC, however, is the final authority in just what can happen and when it can happen.

It is indeed a shame that the period to get one's license has grown from the 6-7 weeks it took in 1953 when I got my license to the 9-11 weeks it sometimes takes today. Moreover, in the "olden days" that wait gave us time to assemble a station; today a quick trip to the store permits the station components to be acquired and I expect heightens the frustration at the delay.

Tod Olson, K0T0  
ARRL Director, Dakota Division

```
+-----+
| Tod Olson, K0T0          | E-Mail tao@maroon.tc.umn.edu |
|                          | MCI address 246-8130        |
|                          | Voice 1-612-473-6478       |
| 292 Heather Lane        | FAX 1-612-473-7474         |
| Long Lake, MN 55356-9439 | "There are no solutions, just |
|                          | different sets of problems!" |
+-----+
```

-----  
Date: Wed, 13 Apr 1994 15:01:16 GMT  
From: pacbell.com!amdahl!netcomsv!netcom.com!billcorn@ames.arpa  
Subject: LICENSING DELAYS  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

EE DEPT NOVELL SUPERVISOR (supervisor@rose-hulman.edu) wrote:  
: I understand that there are 4 people in Gettysberg working on 610 apps.

I am waitting 60 days for a back order on the 610 formes themselves.  
So I guess if you can't get the forms, you can't clog up the system!!!!

Bill Cornutt WB6YWI

--

```
-----
                When I awake in the morning,
                  I get out of bed.

billcorn@netcom.com
-----
```

-----  
Date: 14 Apr 94 05:11:00 GMT  
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!cs.utexas.edu!swrinde!news.uh.edu!rosie.uh.edu!  
st3qi@ucbvax.berkeley.edu

Subject: LICENSING DELAYS  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <supervisor.1.766178900@rose-hulman.edu>, supervisor@rose-hulman.edu (EE DEPT NOVELL SUPERVISOR) writes...

> Im just getting into this medium, and this is the first day I have  
>checked into this "net", so mabe this has all been hashed out and the FCC  
>will begin May first with getting licenses back to our new hams in two  
>weeks. But 12 weeks is absolutely assinine. I understand that there are  
>4 people in Gettysberg working on 610 apps. No they probably cant handle  
>the influx of requests.

>#1 Lets cut the beaurocratic excuses and get this mess cleaned up.

>#2 Lets get our public servants organized so that they can do their  
> jobs effeciantly for the nation.

>

>Where is our ARRL ???? What are our ARRL lawers in washington doing?

>Again we dont want to hear all the reasons and excuses! lets get something  
>done! NOW!

>

> I once had a commanding officer in the navy tell his junior officers;  
>Don't bring me problems, damn it, bring me solutions!

>

>Solution # 1

> ARRL go to washimhton to the FCC and TELL them that the league will  
>coordinate the volenteers from the amateur fraternity to come to Getttsyberg  
>and provide the labor to get them up to date. No excuses accepted.  
>If they will not accept our help, then the league should sue the FCC in court  
>to accept the help and start a national public awareness campaine to expose  
>this mess.

>

>Solution # 2

> Offer, at no cost to the government, to study the processing  
>procedures and come up with a list of solutions to make them more  
>effeciant.

>

>

> No I'm not waiting myself for a license. I've held mine for  
>34 years. But I do have a group of Boy Scouts who have worked sence last  
>Oct. to pass their exams in Feb. and are still waiting like I'm sure  
>hundreds, thousands of others are for their first ticket. I think MY  
>league should be doing something, NOW!

>

>Dave Gahimer

>K9ZCE

I guess you've been living on Mars lately, because if you would read the newsletters that are being published you would realize that the FCC is in the middle of a major computer upgrade. They are sh!t canning their

main frame and going online with a PC-LAN system.

So, give the FCC a little slack. They're going to make things alot faster and easier shortly, but we have to give them some time to put the new computers in. The 610 turn-around time is going to be slow until they get their new system in. Take a chill pill!!

But, to properly respond to your post... if you want to REALLY make changes to the FCC, get Uncle Billy to appoint you as the Director of the FCC and then you can MAYBE make some changes. At least you'll have some fancy letter head.

-Brad Killebrew N5LJV  
-st3qi@jetson.uh.edu  
-President, Univ of Houston ARC

-----  
Date: 13 Apr 94 13:06:47 -0500  
From: yale.edu!noc.near.net!news.tufts.edu!news.hnrc.tufts.edu!jerry@yale.arpa  
Subject: NEW RIG, BEGINNER  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1994Apr9.034133.13269@intercom.com>, allanwng@intercom.com (Allan W. Ng) writes:

> All: I am considering buying the Radio Shack 2 meter hand held during the  
> sale this month. If I do get it how do I test it out to make sure that  
> it works okay, other than talking through it?

If you can't talk through it because you don't have your ticket, allow someone who's licensed to test it for you!

-----  
Date: (null)  
From: (null)  
>Committee Members:  
>Mr. Steve Mendelsohn, WA2DHF, Chairman  
>Mr. Frank Butler, W4RH  
>Mr. Tom Comstock, N5TC  
>Mr. John Kanode, N4MM  
>Mr. Brad Wyatt, K6WR

Not too many 1's and 0's on the committee! Funny how people always jump to attribute the worst possible motives to the ARRL.

Actually the big advantage of the 1 district is that there are many more available calls to choose from (because of fewer hams). I was lucky



enough to live in Conn. the last time preferred calls were available.  
(1975? or thereabouts)

AL N1AL

-----  
End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #171

\*\*\*\*\*